DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 791 CS 500 357

AUTHOR Litvin, Joel
TITLE The Psychologies and the Humanization of Communication.
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Assn. (Montreal, April, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Science Research; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Humanization; Human Relations; *Individual Psychology; Interaction Process Analysis; Interpersonal Relationship; *Psychological Needs; Research Opportunities

ABSTRACT

Theoretical and methodological developments in the psychologies have had an effect on the direction of research and training in speech. To continue to benefit from association with the psychologies, speech teachers would do well to familiarize themselves with the philosophy-psychology of the humanistic movement. The humanistic approach proceeds from the concept that there are certain universal qualities which characterize man and prove his uniqueness among all species. Research and training that considers the impact of humanistic variables on communication results may significantly contribute to a humanizing of the field of speech and to an understanding of the essentially human nature of man as a communicator. (EE)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Psychologies and the Humanization of Communication

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

Joel Litvin

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joel Litvin
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ED 079791

Introduction

The field of speech has had a long and fruitful association with the psychologies. This paper is designed to explore that association. To do so, the paper proceeds in the following manner. First, the field of psychology is described, its history reviewed, and significant theories, concepts and methodologies identified. Next, influences of the dominant psychologies on areas of study within the field of speech are discussed. Finally, the value of our past association with the psychologies is examined, and a suggestion is made for continuing our relationship with a new force in psychology, one which may enable speech communication research and training to focus more directly on those unique characteristics which distinguish man as a symbolizing, communicating human being

Description of the Field of Psychology

To explore the labrinth called psychology is to venture into a dense forest of roots, trunks, and branches. The word psychology is derived from two Greek words (psyche and logos) meaning the study of the soul or mind. This definition hardly lights our way. A variety of schema have been used in describing psychology. For

CS 500 357

example, the field has been divided into academic and applied branches. Using this division, academic psychology refers to those psychological topics which are primarily practiced or applied. A number of subjects such as physiological psychology, perception, and learning are considered experimental. Non experimental fields within the academic area include social psychology and developmental psychology. The academic field is also designated by topics such as cognition, abnormal behavior, motivation and aesthetics. Applied psychology, as opposed to academic psychology, includes educational psychology, clinical psychology, counseling psychology, and industrial psychology. Psychology has also been described in terms of its human landmarks, e.g., Locke, Wundt, Titchner, Freud, Jung, Watson, Hull, Skinner, Maslow, Bugental, and Rogers. Yet another taxonomy makes reference to schools of psychology, e.g., structuralism, functionalism, behaviorism, gestalt, psychoanalytic, and humanism. Since no classification scheme holds sway in current psychological circles, this writer feels safe in being eclectic, and chosing referents to psychology solely on the basis of advancing his theme.

There appears to be consensus among social scientists that modern psychology consists of two major schools and a "third force." The establishment of the two schools which dominate psychology today, the behavioral and psychoanalytic-personality schools, depended on two major historic developments; psychology's

association, and later break with philosophy and the development of a scientific methodology in psychology. A brief historic summary of those developments will both refresh the reader's memory and set the stage for a discussion of the relationship of the psychologies to speech.

Brief Historic Review of the Growth and Development of the Psychologies

Psychology's kinship with philosophy is made apparent by the similarities between them. Philosophy has historically endeavored to understand and explain human nature and man's mental life. All the ideas and solutions which philosophy offered to explain human nature, mind, consciousness, mental processes (perception, learning, cognition, reasoning, etc.) constitute the psychological thought of philosophy.

Our historic review begins with an examination of some of the major philosophical contributions of Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, for their philosophical premises laid a foundation for psychology. In the 17th Century Descartes reconceptualized the notion of the duality of mind and body. He pointed out that there occurred a psychophysical interaction between them. He argued that the mind as manifested in thought, required study through introspection, a mode of study different from the study of the body, manifested in action, and studied through the methods of the natural sciences. The emphasis placed on the study of the mind by Descartes freed the mind-body duality from earlier medieval

interpretations and initiated an interest in the study of the mind which occupied philosophers for the next 200 years. Hobbes, a contemporary of Descartes, raised the question: "What exactly is involved in an act of perception?" His answer was an argument for the subjectivity of perception. He reasoned that we perceive things only subjectively through the effects which they produce upon us. Locke laid the foundation of empirical philosophy by insisting that experience was the only means of attaining knowledge. He argued that the human mind was a tabula rosa and that all ideas were acquired by the senses or through reflection. In the 18th Century, Berkeley added the thesis that the material world was made or generated by the mind. Hume, also concerned with the relationship of knowledge to experience, denied that knowledge of universal truths was either possible or valid. He claimed that one can not know anything of the universal nature of things but can only know what is in one's consciousness. This empirical approach to knowledge described in the writings of Locke and developed by Hume stressed the importance of processes of sensation, encouraged analysis of conscious experience into elements, urged that elements synthesize to form more complex mental processes through the mechanism of association, and viewed these processes as occurring on the conscious level.

The notion of association, basic to Hume's explanation of the process of reasoning, exerted a significant influence on the

development of scientific psychology. The school of associationism, originated by British philosophers in the 18th Century, had as its basic premise that an analysis of the human mind disclosed the realization that thoughts come in succession, that one thought evokes another and that some thoughts always appear together. Moreover, certain events if experienced at the same time or in succession are consciously remembered together. The effect of empirical philosophy, strengthened by the concept of association, was that it raised the prestige of psychology by stressing experience as the source of knowledge and emphasizing the value of empirical data.

By the end of the 18th Century, the philosophical-psychological view of man was that he was born with the ability to receive sensations, to derive simple ideas from them and to combine these simple ideas into complex ideas. These complex ideas were considered to mirror the external reality from which they were ultimately derived. This process of forming true ideas was called reason. Psychology had come into its own by breaking with the basic tenets of medieval psychology-philosophy. Medieval psychology had accepted the concept of innate ideas; modern psychology denied this concept, arguing instead that all ideas derive from experience.

The myriad influences on psychology in the 19th Century stretch across geographic boundaries and scientific disciplines. The reader will have noticed that this broad discussion of influences

on the development of psychology has excluded references to developments in a number of significant physical sciences. Having excluded a discussion of the influence of Newtonian psysics on the development of psychology in the 18th Century, this writer feels justified in excluding a discussion of the influence of Darwinian biology in the 19th Century. Needless to say, developments in the physical sciences had direct and significant effects on the development of a scientific methodology in psychology. These subtle and complex influences are simply beyond the scope of this brief historic review.

The first major period in the growth of psychology was philosophical in nature. The second major period was characterized by emphasis on the development of a systematic approach to investigating the domain which had been identified. The origins of this second period are found in the work of Wundt and Titchner. Together they founded the first school of thought in psychology, structuralism. Early structuralists set for themselves the task of discovering the nature of elementary conscious experiences. Wundt stated that the subject matter of psychology was experience. He believed that the method of study should be experiential, utilizing the tools of self observation and introspection. Psychology, according to Wundt, has as its goal the analysis of conscious processes into their basic elements, the discovery of how these elements were connected, and determination of the laws of connection.

Structuralists were primarily interested in what happens in the human mind and how it happens. Functionalists, members of the second school of psychology, added the question: "Why do things happen in the mind?" The breadth of interest within the school of functionalism is so great that no summary could do it justice. The major contribution of the functionalists was to shift interest in psychology from questions of structure to questions of function. Functionalists emphasized the importance of understanding mental operations, in contrast to the structuralists interest in mental elements. Functionalists also broadened the field of psychology by adding to the field the areas of animal psychology, the study of children, the mentally retarded, and the insane. The need for scientific methods in these new areas of study led to an abandonment of introspection, and the creation of more functional approaches like the use of mental tests, questionnaires, objective descriptions of behavior. The use of these tools marked the beginnings of scientific psychology.

In 1913, when structuralism was at its height and functionalism had reached full maturity, J. B. Watson issued a challenge to the old psychologies, and with that challenge ushered in the era of a new psychology: behaviorism. Watson argued for a totally objective psychology, dealing only with observable behavioral acts that were to be objectively described in such terms as stimulus and response. He wanted to apply to human beings the experimental procedures and

principles of animal psychology. He wanted to reject all mentalistic concepts, e.g., image, mind, and consciousness. The development of Watson's behaviorism was influenced by three trends of thought from the psychological-philosophical past. First, Compe's positivism, which emphasized that the only valid knowledge is that which is social in nature and objectively observable. Secondly, functionalism, which had emphasized behavior and more objective methods of studying it, and had expressed dissatisfaction with introspection and the study of consciousness. Thirdly, work by functionalists in animal psychology, work which grew out of evolutionary theory and which led to attempts to demonstrate the presence of mind in lower organisms, and the continuity between human and animal minds.

It may be suggested that Watson's plea for behaviorism was based on two arguments. Theoretically, the argument was that behavior could be adequately understood without reference to consciousness, mental life, etc. In supporting this argument, Watson wrote:

> Psychology as the behaviorist view it is a purely objective experimental branch of natural science. Its theorecical goal is the prediction and control of behavior. Introspection forms no essential part of its methods, nor is the scientific value of its data dependent upon the readiness with which they lend themselves to interpretation in terms of consciousness.

> The behaviorist, in his efforts to get a unitary scheme of animal response, recognizes no dividing line between man and brute. The behavior of man, with all of its refinement and complexity, forms only a part of the behaviorist's total scheme of investigation. (1913,p.153)

Watson's second line of argument rested on the assumption that if behavior is determined by environmental conditions, accordingly, it promises that systematic alternations of environmental conditions can exert systematic control over behavior. Thus a kind of ethic was being advocated. Explaining this position, Watson wrote:

> I think behaviorism does lay a foundation for saner living...I wish I had time more fully to describe this, to picture to you the kind of rich and wonderful individual we should make of every healthy child if only we could let it shape itself properly and then provide for it a universe in which it could exercise that organization...For the universe will change if you bring up your children, not in the freedom of the libertine, but in behavioristic freedon-a freedom which we cannot even picture in words, so little do we know of it. (1925,p.248).

After Watson's assault on existing psychologies and his introduction of behaviorism, a number of behaviorists like Holt, Weiss, Lashley, Tolman, Guthrie, and Hull modified and reshaped Watson's behaviorism both conceptually and methodologically. A recapitulation of those modifications is not possible here, but a word must be said about the contributions of Hull, for he may be the behaviorists' most significant theorist.

Hull believed that human behavior involved a continuing interaction between the organism and the environment. For him, the objective stimuli provided by the environment and the objective

behavioral responses provided by the organism were observable facts. This interaction, he believed, took place within a larger context that could be totally defined in observable stimulus-response terms. This broader context was the biological adaptation of the organism to its unique environment. The survival of the organism was aided by this biological adaption. Hull was motivated theoretically to explain ostensibly purposeful behavior in terms of nonpurposeful, automatic or mechanical principles. He attempted to do this by explaining the Pavlovian reflex theory and the theory of contingetn reinforcement. Although the theoretical contributions of Hull have had a lasting impact on behavioral psychology, it was Skinner who energized the field by putting aside theoretical issues and returning behaviorism to its Watsonian beginnings. Skinner's behaviorism was descriptive, atheoretical, devoted to the study of responses. His method was to examine observable behaviors. His belief was that scientific inquiry serves to establish functional relations between the antecedent experimenter controlled stimulus conditions and the subsequent response of the organism. Skinner was not concerned with theorizing or speculating about what might be going on inside the organism.

Behaviorism took modern psychology in one direction: Freud and his psychoanalytic approach took it in another. Freud expanded the field of modern psychology by identifying a new subject matter, and by providing new theories and methodologies. His subject matter

was the emotionally disturbed person. His theories centered on the study of the unconscious and conscious aspects of personality, instincts, anxiety, and stages of personality development. Basic to the theoretical development of these phenomenon were such elements as libido, ego, superego, the neuroses, instincts, dreams and the psychosexual stages of development.

Just as men like Hull and Skinner modified and reshaped Watson's behaviorism, so too, did Jung, Adler and Horney modify and reshape many of Freud's basic theoretical premises. The ramifications of these modifications are well told in texts on modern psychology and will not be retold here. For our purposes it is important simply to understand that by the beginning of the 1930's behaviorism and psychoanalytic and personality approaches dominated psychology.

By the time these major influences and emerged, the struggle for dominance by earlier schools had faded. With the disappearance of schools came the disappearance of efforts to establish theories which could unify the field of psychology. In place of such grand designs came the gradual development of mini theory; the establishment of theory within major research areas: learning, motivation, perception and personality. Between 1930 and 1950 there was a period of consolidation of gains in modern psychology. No new challenges to the dominant psychologies were made, and no serious complaints were issued concerning the scientific methodologies associated with behavioral research.

The relative calm which characterized psychology for a quarter of a century ended abruptly with the emergence of the "third force" called humanistic psychology. James F. T. Bugental, one of the movement's founders, has explained the nature of the humanistic movement:

> Humanistic psychology may be defined as the third main branch of the general field of psychology (the two already in existence being the psychoanalytic and the behaviorist), and as such is primarily concerned with those human capacities and potentialities that have little or no systematic place, either in positivist or behaviorist theory or in classical psychoanalytic theory: e.g., love, creativity, self, growth, organism, basic need-gratification, self-actualization, higher values, being, becoming, spontaneity, play, humor, affection, naturalness, warmth, ego-transcendence, objectivity, autonomy, responsibility, meaning, fairplay, transcendental experience, psychological health, and related concepts. This approach can also be characterized by the writings of Allport, Angyal, Asch, Buhler, Fromm, Goldstein, Horney, Maslow, May, Moustakas, Rogers, Wertheimer, etc., as well as by certain aspects of the writings of Jung, Adler, and the psychoanalytic ego psychologists, existential and phenomenological psychologists. (1964,p.22).

Bugental has further clarified the place of humanistic psychology in the general field by indicating six fundamental points of emphasis that distinguish humanistic psychology from behaviorism:

1. Adequate understanding of human nature cannot be based exclusively (or even in large part) on research findings from animal studies. Again, man is not "a larger white rat," and a psychology based on animal data obviously excludes distinctly human processes and experiences.

2. The research topics chosen for investigation must be

meaningful in terms of human existence and not selected solely on the basis of their suitability for laboratory investigation and quantification. Currently, topics not amenable to experimental treatment tend to be ignored.

3. Primary attention should be focused on man's subjective internal experiences not on elements of overt behavior. This is not to suggest that overt behavior be discarded as a subject of study, but rather that it should not be the only subject of investigation.

4. The continuing mutual influence of the so-called pure psychology and applied psychology should be recognized. The attempt to sharply divorce them is detrimental to both.

5. Psychology should be concerned with the unique individual case instead of the average performance of groups. The current group emphasis ignores the atypical, the exception, the person who deviates from the average.

6. Psychology should seek "that which may expand or enrich man's experience. (1967, p.9).

From this description of the philosophy of humanistic psychology it is apparent that adherents to the humanistic movement resist the behaviorist's conception of man as an animal functioning mechanically and deterministically in response to his environment.

We have briefly reviewed some of the major historic developments

in psychology. Our intent has been to demonstrate that developments in the psychologies have led to a number of orientations to the study of human behavior, and that each stands for a different notion of what should be known about human behavior, and how that knowledge should be obtained. The behavioral approach appears to stress the reduction of human behavior to a series of stimulus and response behaviors. This attitude toward human behavior provides the researcher with an uncomplicated methodology for objectively observing and recording such behavior. The intention of obtaining information about such behavior appears to be for its utilization in controlling or modifying actions to conform to "desirable" models of appropriate behavior. Psychoanalytic approaches and theories of personality associated with the psychoanalytic school were developed to explain abnormal behavior, and methodologies were developed to correct or change such behaviors so that an individual might better adjust himself to the expectations of his society. The humanistic orientation seems to encompass the gestalt notion of the importance of viewing the complete organism in relation to its total situation. The purpose of such study is to provide man with an understanding of those essentially human behaviors which influence him and affect his destiny.

Through this review of major historic developments in psychology we have attempted to demonstrate that by the beginning of the 1930's two dominant schools of psychology and a number of significant

psychological concepts had emerged. The following discussion explores the influence of many of these concepts on developments in curriculum, theory and methodological approaches to research and training in speech.

Influences of the Psychologies on Developments in the Field of Speech

It would require the most ambitious of historians to trace the intricate pattern of relationships which tie developments in the psychologies to the development of curriculum, theory and methodology in the field of speech. However, by providing a general review of some areas in which the psychologies have influenced speech, we may be better able to consider our kinship with psychology and to discuss how to better take advantage of the relationship.

During the 1930's a number of psychological concepts explaining the origins and developmental stages of personality had gained acceptance in academic circles. Although Freud provided the stimulus for the study of personality, the writings of Jung, Adler and Allport appear to have had the greatest influence on early teachers of speech. For example, Jung's concept that personality moves in two different directions, extroverted or introverted, was utilized by speech teachers in categorizing speakers. Adler's theory that man strives to overcome his feelings of inferiority and achieve superiority provided the speech teacher with an approach to training. Allport's work on personality traits stimulated such interest in the field of speech that an era of trait studies was initiated. Perhaps more than

any other concept, it was Allport's view of personality as a dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment, which provided the field of speech with a fresh point of view regarding speech training and public speaking.

Elwood Murray was the first speech teacher to focus on the significance of the relationship of personality and speech performance. Murray, in accepting the concept of the personality as a dynamic organization within the individual, turned his attention to the study of those correlates of personality which might be positively affected by speech training. In 1934 Dr. Murray wrote Speech Personality. The theme of this pioneering text was that "Speech and personality grow, develop, differentiate and become refined together. Speech is a phase of personality. In many respects speech and personality are one and the same thing." (1944,p.8).

Following the leadership of Elwood Murray, and the psychological theories of personality developed by psychologists like Jung, Adler and Allport, speech training and research in the field shifted from a technics approach to a focus on the relationship of personality correlates to speaking effectiveness. This shift was demonstrated by articles concerning personality and speech effectiveness by Young (1931), Mason (1938), Murray (1934, 1934, 1940), Rose (1940), Gilkinson and Knower (1940), Dow (1941), and Moore (1943). In addition to the influence of psychological theory, a number of devices

developed for quantitatively measuring personality also gave impetus to the study of personality in the field of speech. Scales were developed for measuring such traits as emotional adjustment, social adjustment, inferiority, introversion and extroversion, morale, vocational interests and leanings toward psychological masculinity and femininity. These measures were used in a series of investigations conducted in speech in the 30's and early 40's. They were designed to ascertain to what extent such tests could enable one to understand more clearly the relationship of characteristics of personality to effective speech.

In the 30's the personality theories were influential in changing the speech teacher's approach to speech training. During this same period methodological and theoretical developments in psychology concerning the study of groups cleared the way for the scientific study of group processes in speech. The need for instruments which could accurately measure group processes led to a number of scientific developments. Bogardus developed a scale of social distance; Likert and Thurstone developed rating scales; Cattell developed statistical procedures suited for data analysis; observation categories were being developed; Moreno's work in sociometry was in progress.

On the theoretical front a battle which had been brewing culminated in an argument between William McDougall and Floyd Allport over the concept of the group mind. At one extreme was McDougall's position that groups, institutions, and culture have a

reality quite apart from the particular individuals who participate in them. Allport, on the other hand, argued that only individuals are real and that groups or institutions are sets of ideals, thoughts, and habits repeated in each individual mind and existing only in those minds.

Kurt Lewin both resolved the conflict and placed group dynamics on a firm footing. He indicated that groups and individuals are merely different aspects of the same phenomenon in constant interaction with each other. His topological psychology, with its gestalt orientation, was developed to demonstrate that human behavior must be related not only to psychological needs or S-R behavior but to the total situation as organized or structured by the organism. His basic premise was that behavior is the product of a field of interdependent determinants known as life space or social space. Lewin's theoretical contributions, and developments in group training which were occurring at the National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine, ushered in an era of interest in group dynamics, training for effective membership in groups and research on variables associated with group life. As Eisenson et al, (1963) have pointed out, much group research has focused on psychological forces of group cohesiveness, group goals, group interaction, attraction to the group, resistence to change, morale, leadership behavior, communication structures, power relationships, interpersonal relationships, feedback and perception. Many of these psychological concepts later became variables studied

in group research in speech. However, whereas the social psychologist had been chiefly interested in the study of performance effectiveness on final group outputs, communication scholars have studied the communicative acts of group members as individual communicators in a group setting, that is, as senders and receivers of messages. Clearly, it is the focus on message variables in group research which has distinguished this research from work done in the psychologies.

Although it may be said that Aristotle was the first psychologist to influence the speech teacher's interest in persuasion, it was the wealth of social psychological theory developed in the 40's and 50's which provided the major impetus for speech research in persuasion. A number of substantial experimental studies were conducted by Carl Hovland and his associates immediately after World War II. Hovland's first investigations were concerned with the issue of purposive interpersonal influence. He was interested in discovering how systematic differences in relevant source, message, channel or receiver variables affect persuasive success. Numerous single variable studies were conducted by the Hovland group. These focused on the persuasive effect of high and low credible sources, one and two sided messages, and strong vs. mild fear-arousing appeals. The work of Hovland, the development of cognitive consistency theories (Heider, Newcomb, Osgood and Tannenbaum, Rosenberg, Rokeach, Festinger), and McGuire's interest in immunization as an inhibitor of attitude

change, opened up a vast range of research possibilities which scholars in speech were quick to seize upon. Hovland's work led to the speech teacher's research interest in source credibility; interest in the effects of selective exposure and self persuasion emanated from questions raised by consistency theories; McGuire's work has opened up new frontiers for research in persuasion.

An Evaluation of Our Relationship with the Psychologies

It has been suggested that developments in research and training in speech closely parallel developments in research and theory development in the psychologies. Having made a long winded case for the relationship of psychology to speech, some evaluative comments are in order. What have we accomplished by keeping up with the latest developments in the psychologies? Clearly we have utilized a variety of psychological theories to examine a host of variables which affect some aspect of man's measurable communication behavior. We have scrutinized man as a speaker, as an oral reader, as a persuader, as a small group participant, and recently, as a member of a two person group. We have measured the effects of man's behavior on others, and of other's behavior on him. We have subdivided man and partitioned him; the autopsy has been fairly complete. But what does all this probing and dissecting mean? Such introspective questioning has seldom been a popular pastime of teachers and scholars. Yet if we meet here to explore ways of humanizing our field, if we are willing to risk a few moments of introspection, then we must regard

our past with more than a wistful eye. We have learned much about man as a communicator. We have successfully described his communicative behavior in a variety of social situations, and our ability to predict and understand his behavior has been significantly enhanced by the formulative, descriptive and experimental research conducted in our field during the past half century. No one can accuse us of not keeping up. We have adopted the most advanced scientific methodologies. We have learned to view man's communicative behavior objectively and scientifically.

Toward a Humanization of the Field of Speech

Let those conducting purely scientific, objective research keep on. They are making important contributions to our field. For a moment, however, let me address those of you who may be uncommitted to an approach to knowing. You realize that all ways of knowing proceed from the formulating and testing of hypotheses. You know too that one's construction of hypotheses grow out of one's psychological approach to, and philosophy of, the nature of man. You understand, for example, that the behaviorist's research is influenced by his belief that man is a machine, a complicated, but understandable machine; a machine with thoughts and behaviors which can be manipulated for some undefined good. Regarding man from a different perspective, the Freudian's research proceeds from a view of man as an irrational being, helpless in the grip of his past. From the vast array of philosophies and psychologies of man which should one choose? For the uncommitted let me suggest a philosophy-

psychology which may lead you to construct and test hypotheses which can ultimately lead to a greater understanding of the qualities of man which shape his being and define his humanness.

Consider a few of the basic tenets of humanistic psychology. Man is more than the sum of his parts. Man's uniqueness is expressed through his relationships with his fellows. Man is aware, and that part of his awareness available to him is an essential part of his being. Man is an intentional being. He intends through having purpose, through valuing, and through creating and recognizing meaning. If one accepts this view, then one must seek to know how these characteristics are reflected in man's communicative behavior. The path to such knowing may, of course, conflict with some carefully developed and much cherished ways of knowing. In order to study such variables as love, creativity, self, growth, self actualization, values, becoming, spontaneity, play, humor, and meaning it may be necessary on occasion to abandon impersonal, "purely objective," observable methods. What is the danger in this departure from objectivity? Must one suspend interest in "knowing" about the unique essences of man until appropriate "scientific methodologies" are produced? If one answers no, then we have reached the crucial point in the discussion.

What is it that we want to know as a discipline? We want to learn about the origins of human communication, to understand the processes of human thought and of human interaction, and to discover

how to predict human communicative behavior. These are goals worthy of the men pursuing them. It is not being suggested that we abandon our past, radicalize our field, or rebel against the methods of scientific inquiry. It is being suggested that since we have accepted the notion that developments in the psychologies and developments in the field of speech have been inextricably related, it seems reasonable for speech teachers and scholars to continue to attend to those developments in the psychologies which may contribute to the growth of the speech field. It is being suggested here that the philosophy of humanistic psychology provides a new field of inquiry and an approach to knowing which may lead to a humanizing of the field of speech.

The existence of humanistic variables like love, creativity, and humor, mentioned earlier, require no empirical validation. The history and literature of mankind demonstrate the universality of these phenomena. Thus our research and training can proceed from the given that there are certain universal qualities which characterize man and prove his uniqueness among all species. How might the speech teacher and scholar explore humanistic variables in conducting his research and training? Although the possibilities appear infinite, perhaps a few suggestions will stimulate further investigation. Elwood Murray set the field of speech on a humanistic course when he observed that speech and personality grow, develop, differentiate and become refined together. It is consistent with our tradition

as a field of inquiry then, to examine those characteristics which comprise the personality, for our understanding of man's human communication behavior is bound up in our understanding of his total behavior as a human being. If we accept the idea that to understand man the communicator, we must understand man, the whole human being, then our research and training might include an investigation of variables which seem to characterize man in his most human state. Our interest in speech training, then, might well turn toward an understanding of how such variables as play, humor, creativity, spontaneity, affect message sending and receiving in interpersonal and public settings. Our analyses of audience behaviors might examine these same variables. Investigations of group discussion might include the study of how an individual member's self concept or striving for self actualization affects his message behavior, willingness to participate in group processes, and satisfaction with group membership. Studies in persuasion might concern an examination of how creativity, spontaneity, and value orientations influence one's receptivity to persuasive messages.

Barnlund (1968) has indicated that interpersonal communication is concerned with the investigation of relatively informal social situations in which persons in face-to-face encounters sustain a focused interaction through the reciprocal exchange of verbal and nonverbal cues. If we choose to fully embrace interpersonal communication as an area within our field, we may utilize humanistic

variables such as trust, love, humor, self disclosure and self actualization to gain greater insight into those forces influencing man's interpersonal transactions.

For those of us who do not see a disjuncture between the study of humanistic, subjective variables and behavioral, objective ones, great new research vistas are open. For we can design and conduct studies in which we examine the influence of both humanistic and behavioral variables on communication outcomes. We can simultaneously explore the behavioral content of symbolic interaction and strive to understand the humanistic, relational aspects of human transaction.

It has been the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that theoretical and methodological developments in the psychologies have had an effect on the direction of research and training in speech. To continue to benefit from our association with the psychologies, it has been suggested that speech teachers familiarize themselves with the philosophy-psychology of the humanistic movement. Research and training taking into account the impact of humanistic variables on communication outcomes may significantly contribute to a humanizing of the field of speech, and to an understanding of the essentially human nature of man as a communicator.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Barnlund, D. Interpersonal Communication: Survey and Studies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Cantril, H., C.H. Bumstead. Reflections on the Human Venture. New York: University Press, 1960.

Eisenson, J., J.J. Auer, J.V. Irwin. The Psychology of Communication. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Helson, Harry (Ed.) Theoretical Foundations of Psychology. New York: D. Van Nostrand, Co., Inc., 1951.

Hovland, C.I., A.A. Lumsdaine, F.D. Sheffield. Communication and Persuasion; Psychological Studies of Opinion Change. Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1953.

Landauer, T.K. Psychology: A Brief Overview. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Lewin, K. Resolving Social Conflicts. (Lewin, G.W., Ed.) New York: Harper, 1948.

Misiak, H. V.S. Sexton. History of Psychology: An Overview. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1966.

Murray, Elwood. The Speech Personality. Chicago: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1944

Sartain, A.Q. et al. Psychology: Understanding Human Behavior. New York McGraw-Hill 1958.

Schultz, D.B. A History of Modern Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1969.

Skinner, B.F. Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Watson, J.B. Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1919.

Watson, J.B. Behaviorism. New York: Norton, 1925.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARTICLES

Bugental, J.F.T. The third force in psychology, Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 4-5, (1964-65), 19-25.

Bugental, J.F.T. The challenge that is man, Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 7, (1967), 1-9.

Dow, Clyde, W. The personality traits of effective public speakers, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 27, (1951), 525-532.

Gilkinson, H., F. H. Knower. Individual differences among students of speech as revealed by psychological tests, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 26, (1940), 243-255.

Grimes, Wilma H. Choosing literature for oral reading: a psychological basis, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 42, (1956), 133-138.

Mason, J.B. Personality and the forum leader, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 24, (1938), 39-44.

McGuire, W.J. Attitudes and opinions, Annual Review of Psychology, 17, (1966), 475.

Miller, Gerald R. Communication and persuasion research: current problems and prospects, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54, (1968) 268-276.

Moore, W.E. Factors related to achievement and improvement in public speaking, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 29, (1943), 213-217.

Murray, Elwood. Speech standards and social integration, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 26, (1940), 73-80.

Rose, Forrest H. Training in speech and changes in personality, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 26, (1940), 193-196.

Utterback, W.E. An appraisal of psychological research in speech, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 33, (1937), 175-182.

Watson, J.B. Psychology as the behaviorist views it, Psychological Review, 20, (1913), 158-177.

Woolbert, C.H. Psychology from the standpoint of a speech teacher, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 16, (1930), 9-18.

Young, L.W. Character development through speech training, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 17 (1931), 532-538.